

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENTTED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bac 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/825,585	04/04/2001	Sehyun Kim	2550-004	3719	
7	590 07/28/2004		EXAMINER		
John K. Abokhair			WOODWARD, ANA LUCRECIA		
Roberts, Abok 11800 Sunrise	thair & Mardula, L.L.C. Valley Drive		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Suite1000 Reston, VA 20191-5302			17) I DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			MK
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Astion Comments	09/825,585	KIM, SEHYUN	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
- HAU NO 2475	Ana L. Woodward	1711	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	;
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror , cause the application to become ABANDON	ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communic ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation.
Status	1/2001/1/	12 2011	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	action is non-final. Ince except for formal matters, pr	rosecution as to the meri	ts is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) / 2/ is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) / 2/ is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		` '
	taninion rioto ino allabrica omo		- -
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document: application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv	tion No	9
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receiv	ed.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	y (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s)/(PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D	Patent Application (PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of copolymers of ethylene as the impact modifier in the reply filed on July 6, 2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1, 10 and 19, it is suggested that "polypropylene polymer" read --propylene polymer-- or --polypropylene-- to avoid redundancy.

In claims 1, 10 and 19, the impact polypropylene component and the impact modifier component read on one and the same entity. This is because the polypropylene contains ethylene and, as such, reads on an "olefin copolymer of ethylene".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/825,585

Art Unit: 1711

4. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,852,115 (Young et al) further in view of U.S. 6,306,318 (Ricciardelli et al) or U.S. 6,228,479 (Zegler et al).

Young et al disclose homogeneous thermoplastic blends formed by melt blending, in an extruder under conditions sufficient to produce a homogeneous blend, 1) a carpet scrap, 2) a polymeric compatibilizer and 3) polypropylene and/or ethylene vinyl acetate. Of particular interest are noted examples 88 and 89 of Table 13, containing a blend of carpet scrap, Kraton compatibilizer and polypropylene. In this regard, the exemplified MSL-1 carpet scrap, a multicomponent product comprising 14% nylon, 4% polypropylene, 11% ethylene vinyl acetate and 71% filled ethylene vinyl acetate (see Table 1), reads on the presently claimed scrap material, the exemplified Kraton consisting of polystyrene endblocks and poly(ethylene/butylene) midblocks, reads on the presently claimed ethylene copolymer impact modifier and the exemplified polypropylene, generically embraces the presently claimed polypropylene components containing ethylene units.

Examples 88 and 89 differ in essence from the presently claimed invention only with respect to the amount of Kraton material used. As evidenced by the reference disclosure at column 12, lines 23-27, the compatibilizer can be added in amounts up 30% by weight. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to use up to 30% by weight of the Kraton compatibilizer in the examples with the reasonable expectation of success. It is maintained that a composition comprising, e.g., 45% carpet scrap, 25% polypropylene and 30% Kraton, would fulfill the requirements of the present claims both in terms of the types of materials added and

Application/Control Number: 09/825,585

Art Unit: 1711

their contents. This is because the polypropylene and Kraton would correspond to a "blending composition" per the present claims comprising 45% polypropylene and 55% impact modifier.

As presently recited, the impact modifier does not preclude a copolymer containing polystyrene units in addition to poly(ethylene/butylenes) units.

With respect to claim 4 and 13, it is within the scope of the reference to additionally incorporate ethylene vinyl acetate resin so long as the combination of compatibilizer and ethylene vinyl acetate resin does not exceed 30% by weight (column 12, lines 23-27, column 11, lines 21-28). Accordingly, absent evidence of unusual or unexpected results, no patentability can be seen in the addition of ethylene vinyl acetate resin.

With respect to claim 19, Young et al does not expressly disclose the use of plasticizers. The addition of plasticizers to recycled waste polymeric materials is well known in the art, as shown by the secondary references. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have added a plasticizer to the recycled waste materials of Young et al for its expected additive effect, absent evidence of unusual or unexpected results.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed July 6, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is maintained that the reference's Kraton, consisting of polystyrene endblocks and poly(ethylene/butylene) midblocks, reads on the presently claimed ethylene copolymer impact modifier. As presently recited, the impact modifier does not preclude a copolymer containing polystyrene units in addition to poly(ethylene/butylenes) units.

Art Unit: 1711

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ana L. Woodward whose telephone number is (571) 272-1082.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-21729197 (toll-free).

Ana L. Woodward

Examiner Art Unit 1711

AW